



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/649,270	08/28/2000	Lawrence A. Crowl	SUN1P380/P4501	6759

22434 7590 01/07/2005

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 70250
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER

VU, TUAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/649,270	CROWL ET AL.	
	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Tuan A Vu	2124	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan A Vu.

(3) Steve Beyer.

(2) Anil Khatri.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 January 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Unger, Airon.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant's representative has mentioned that the crux of the invention is about differential name in encoding compiler data, something not addressed by the references used. Examiner has mentioned that known compression algorithms on way or the other will look for common parts of any stream of data, not just compilation code, then submit the common parts under some reduced representation while tagging the non-common parts to it; and that is compacting by creating a differential part aside a common part. That would make the claim no so novel since differential name encoding was known. Also brought up was that the claim should be modified to focus on the size reducing mechanics of the differential name limitation; and that some features concerning the program code entities (e.g. class container) be included in the body of the claim so to make said differential encoding more distinguishable.